

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

(Sacramento)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ROBERT LOUIS FIELD,

Defendant and Appellant.

C060449

(Super.Ct.No.
07F02663)

When police executed a search warrant at the home of defendant Robert Louis Field, they found him naked and kneeling on the bathroom floor attempting to flush methamphetamine, cash and other items down the toilet. Among other things seized by police were methamphetamine, digital scales, pay/owe sheets, plastic baggies and other drug paraphernalia, cash, a police scanner, surveillance cameras, and numerous firearms (some loaded).

A jury found defendant guilty of possessing methamphetamine for sale (Health & Saf. Code, § 11378) while personally armed with

a firearm during commission of the offense. (Pen. Code, § 12022, subd. (c).) After denying defendant's motion to substitute counsel (*People v. Marsden* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 118), the court sentenced him to the middle term of two years, plus a consecutive three-year term for the weapon enhancement, for an aggregate term of five years in state prison. The court imposed a \$1,000 restitution fine (Pen. Code, § 1202.4) and a \$1,000 parole revocation fine (Pen. Code, § 1202.45) stayed pending successful completion of parole, and ordered that the other fees and fines recommended in the probation report would "not be imposed."

Defendant appealed, and we appointed counsel to represent him on appeal. Counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and asks us to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was advised by counsel of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. More than 30 days elapsed, and we received no communication from defendant.

Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no arguable error in favor of defendant.

The judgment is affirmed.

SCOTLAND, P. J.

We concur:

HULL, J.

CANTIL-SAKAUYE, J.